



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,629	03/24/2004	Dennis Cox	062891.0638	6090
5073	7590	11/21/2008		
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			EXAMINER OKORONKWO, CHINWENDU C	
			ART UNIT 2436	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 11/21/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com
glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/808,629	Applicant(s) COX ET AL.	
	Examiner CHINWENDU C. OKORONKWO	Art Unit 2436	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Appeal Re-Open

1. In view of the appeal brief filed on 01/08/2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/Nasser G Moazzami/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2436.

Response to Remarks/Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, with respect to the rejection of the claims have been fully considered but they are moot under new grounds for rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10, 15-21, 27-29 and 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being disclosed by Coley et al. (US Patent No. 5,826,014 hereinafter Coley) in view of Malkin et al. (US Patent No. 6,061,650 hereinafter Malkin).

Regarding claims 1, Coley, discloses a method for blocking an attack on a private network implemented by a routing device interconnecting the private network to a public network, comprising:

- receiving a request for connection from an initiator, over the public network (7:16-19 – “a user operating a host machine 200 who attempts to access the internal network 214 via the public network 202 must go through the firewall”);
- requesting an acknowledgment from the initiator of the request (7:41-59 – “firewall 210 application assess the characteristics of an incoming request and assigns an appropriate proxy agent tailored to the particular protocol and verification requirements of that incoming access request.”).

Coley is silent in determining whether the acknowledgment has been received within a predetermined amount of time and denying the request if the acknowledgment is not received within the predetermined amount of time, however Malkin does provide such a disclosure (5:21-27 – “In step 234, after sending the tunnel registration request, the RAS sets a retransmit time and expects a registration reply from the gateway within a predetermined period of time. The RAS will retransmit the request if a response is not received within the predetermined period of time. After a predetermined number of unsuccessful attempts, the RAS will terminate the PPP connection with the remote node”).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have been motivated to modify the disclosure of Coley with that of Malkin because both disclosures are directed towards network security, particularly within a remote access network. Malkin provides motivation for this combination in the recitation, to implement the mobile routing protocols, additional software needs to be loaded onto the remote node to enable the node to communication with its original network without having to change its network address. As a result, a user is burdened with installing the mobile protocol software on their computer system and

testing it to be sure it operates properly. The need described here lends reason to combine these two references.

Regarding claim 2, Coley, discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the public network is the Internet (Figure 2 element 202).

Regarding claim 3, Coley, discloses the method of claim 2, wherein the routing device is a firewall providing access to the Internet (Figure 2 element 210).

Regarding claim 4, Coley, discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising processing the request if the acknowledgement is received (10:36-40 – “after a proxy successfully completes its set of one or more verification tests, the proxy agent initiates a connection request to the destination machine (and port) on behalf of the incoming access request.”).

Regarding claim 5, Coley, discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising adding an IP address of the initiator to a cache of IP addresses if the acknowledgement is not received (9:32-45 – “Source address verification can be based on a check of the validity of one or more specific addresses, or, on a range of address values (e.g., the first octet has a value of between zero and 100). Such a check involves a determination of whether a host source address of an incoming packet comports with a list of authorized or unauthorized addresses, or

is within a designated range. If the source address is not on the list, the packet is discarded. Referring back to FIG. 3, in the event that the external user 300 attempts to contact a network element behind the firewall 318, the proxy agent can check the source address of the host computer 302. If the proxy agent determines that the host computer 302 does not have an authorized address, the request originating from the host computer 302 is discarded.”).

Regarding claim 6, Coley, discloses the method of claim 5, further comprising denying access through the routing device to any IP address on the cache of IP addresses (11:40-46 – “In the present exemplary scenario the access request message is further analyzed to determine whether the access request is being received during an authorized time period, such as a time of day (step 418). If the time of day during which the access request is received is not authorized, the connection request is denied (step 420). The time of day assessment can be tailored for specified users, source host machines, and/or IP addresses.”).

Regarding claim 7, Coley, discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising storing information about the initiator on a system log for analysis by the system administrator (11:47-50 – “A proxy agent also can assess whether user or user/password information is necessary to gain access (step 422). If not, the proxy agent can initiate the connection (step 424). If the information is required, the proxy agent prompts the user with an appropriately formatted message to

enter a username and/or password information (step 426).”).

Regarding claim 8, Coley, discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising storing information about the request for connection on a system log for analysis by the system administrator (11:7-20 - “ Because the access request seeks to access a destination address residing behind the firewall 318, the access request message is presented to the firewall 318 (step 404). In accordance with an exemplary embodiment, a proxy agent running on the firewall 318 is assigned to the access request in accordance with a preliminary analysis of the port number designation within the packet representing the access request (step 406). In this case, port number 80 (HTTP) would ordinarily be designated in the request. The assessment also can involve a determination of whether the service indicated by the port number comports with the contents of the request (step 408).”).

Regarding claim 9, Coley, is silent in disclosing determining if a prior request for an acknowledgement has been sent to an IP address associated with the initiator and been unacknowledged within a predetermined amount of time, if the acknowledgement is not received, however Malkin does provide such a disclosure (5:21-27 – “In step 234, after sending the tunnel registration request, the RAS sets a retransmit time and expects a registration reply from the gateway within a predetermined period of time. The RAS will retransmit the request if a response is not received within the predetermined period of time. After a

predetermined number of unsuccessful attempts, the RAS will terminate the PPP connection with the remote node”).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have been motivated to modify the disclosure of Coley with that of Malkin because both disclosures are directed towards network security, particularly within a remote access network. Malkin provides motivation for this combination in the recitation, to implement the mobile routing protocols, additional software needs to be loaded onto the remote node to enable the node to communication with its original network without having to change its network address. As a result, a user is burdened with installing the mobile protocol software on their computer system and testing it to be sure it operates properly. The need described here lends reason to combine these two references.

Regarding claim 10, Coley, discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising using diagnostic tools to determine additional information about a source of the request for connection (8:1-9 – “the source address of an access request can be investigated to determine whether the request is suspect or credible. An inherently reliable request may require only a minimum of verification before being connected. While a suspect request may require enhanced verification. Access request verification can include analysis of: source host machine and

source user information; destination host machine and destination user information; and/or time of day analysis.”).

Regarding claim 15, Coley, discloses a method for blocking an attack on a private network implemented by a routing device interconnecting the private network to a public network, comprising:

- receiving an incoming data packet from the public network (7:16-19 – “a user operating a host machine 200 who attempts to access the internal network 214 via the public network 202 must go through the firewall”);
- comparing a source address of the data packet against known internal addresses of the private network (9:6-19 and 32-46 – “investigation of a source address (i.e., the host machine from which the access inquiry originated) of the access request. This permits the proxy agent to make an initial assessment of the authenticity of the request ... Once the source is determined, the proxy agent can run an appropriate combination of verification checks suited to the integrity of the request as indicated by its source”);
- determining if the source address matches a known internal address (9:6-19 and 32-46 – “investigation of a source address (i.e., the host machine from which the access inquiry originated) of the access request. This permits the proxy agent to make an initial assessment of the authenticity of the request ... Once the source is determined, the proxy agent can run

an appropriate combination of verification checks suited to the integrity of the request as indicated by its source”)

Coley does however disclose:

- dropping the data packet (9:39 – “If there is a discrepancy, the request is denied”);
- analyzing a header of the data packet (9:3-8 – “investigation of a source address (i.e., the host machine from which the access inquiry originated) of the access request. This permits the proxy agent to make an initial assessment of the authenticity of the request”);
- determining information regarding a history of the packet (8:5-16 – “source address of an access request can be investigated to determine whether the request is suspect or credible ... Access request verification can include analysis of: source host machine and source user information; destination host machine and destination user information; and/or time of day analysis”);
- determining a real source of the data packet using the information regarding the history of the packet (8:5-16 – “source address of an access request can be investigated to determine whether the request is suspect or credible ... Access request verification can include analysis of: source host machine and source user

Art Unit: 2136

information; destination host machine and destination user

information; and/or time of day analysis"); and

- refusing to process any additional data packets received from the real source of the data packet (9:6-19 and 32-46 – “If there is a discrepancy, the request is denied”).

Regarding claim 16, Coley, discloses the method of claim 15, further comprising storing data about the data packet on a system log, for use and analysis by a system administrator (Rejected under the same rational as claim 7).

Regarding claim 17, Coley, discloses the method of claim 15, wherein the public network is the Internet (Rejected under the same rational as claim 2).

Regarding claim 18, Coley, discloses the method of claim 17, wherein the routing device is a firewall providing access to the Internet (Rejected under the same rational as claim 3).

Regarding claim 19, Coley, discloses the method of claim 15, further comprising forwarding the data packet to the private network if there is not a match (Rejected under the same rational as claim 6).

Art Unit: 2136

Regarding claim 20, Coley, discloses the method of claim 15, further comprising adding an IP address of the data packet to a cache of IP addresses if there is a match (Rejected under the same rational as claim 6).

Regarding claim 21, Coley, discloses the method of claim 20, further comprising denying access through the routing device to any IP address on the cache of IP addresses (Rejected under the same rational as claim 6).

Regarding claim 27, Coley, discloses the method for blocking an attack on a private network implemented by a routing device interconnecting the private network to a public network, comprising:

- receiving a request for connection from an initiator, over the public network (7:16-19 – “a user operating a host machine 200 who attempts to access the internal network 214 via the public network 202 must go through the firewall”);
- requesting an acknowledgment from the initiator of the request (7:41-59 – “firewall 210 application assess the characteristics of an incoming request and assigns an appropriate proxy agent tailored to the particular protocol and verification requirements of that incoming access request.”);
- comparing a source address of the request for connection with known internal addresses of the private network (9:32-46);

Art Unit: 2136

- determining if the source address matches a known internal address (9:32-46); and refusing to process the request for connection if there is a match (9:32-46).

Coley is silent in determining whether the acknowledgment has been received within a predetermined amount of time and denying the request if the acknowledgment is not received within the predetermined amount of time, however Malkin does provide such a disclosure (5:21-27 – “In step 234, after sending the tunnel registration request, the RAS sets a retransmit time and expects a registration reply from the gateway within a predetermined period of time. The RAS will retransmit the request if a response is not received within the predetermined period of time. After a predetermined number of unsuccessful attempts, the RAS will terminate the PPP connection with the remote node”).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have been motivated to modify the disclosure of Coley with that of Malkin because both disclosures are directed towards network security, particularly within a remote access network. Malkin provides motivation for this combination in the recitation, to implement the mobile routing protocols, additional software needs to be loaded onto the remote node to enable the node to communication with its original network without

having to change its network address. As a result, a user is burdened with installing the mobile protocol software on their computer system and testing it to be sure it operates properly. The need described here lends reason to combine these two references.

Regarding claim 28, Coley, discloses system for blocking an attack on a private network, comprising: a routing device being operable to interconnect a private network to a public network, the routing device being further operable to: receive a request for connection from an initiator, over the public network (7:16-19 – “a user operating a host machine 200 who attempts to access the internal network 214 via the public network 202 must go through the firewall”); request an acknowledgment from the initiator of the request (7:41-59 – “firewall 210 application assess the characteristics of an incoming request and assigns an appropriate proxy agent tailored to the particular protocol and verification requirements of that incoming access request.”).

Coley is silent in determining whether the acknowledgment has been received within a predetermined amount of time and denying the request if the acknowledgment is not received within the predetermined amount of time, however Malkin does provide such a disclosure (5:21-27 – “In step 234, after sending the tunnel registration request, the RAS sets a retransmit time and expects a registration reply from the gateway within a

predetermined period of time. The RAS will retransmit the request if a response is not received within the predetermined period of time. After a predetermined number of unsuccessful attempts, the RAS will terminate the PPP connection with the remote node”).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have been motivated to modify the disclosure of Coley with that of Malkin because both disclosures are directed towards network security, particularly within a remote access network. Malkin provides motivation for this combination in the recitation, to implement the mobile routing protocols, additional software needs to be loaded onto the remote node to enable the node to communication with its original network without having to change its network address. As a result, a user is burdened with installing the mobile protocol software on their computer system and testing it to be sure it operates properly. The need described here lends reason to combine these two references.

Regarding claim 29, Coley, discloses system for blocking an attack on a private network, comprising:

- a routing device being operable to interconnect the private network and a public network, the routing device being further operable to: receive an incoming data packet from the public network (7:16-19 – “a user operating

Art Unit: 2136

a host machine 200 who attempts to access the internal network 214 via the public network 202 must go through the firewall”);

- compare a source address of the data packet against known internal addresses of the private network (9:6-19 and 32-46);
- determine if the source address matches a known internal address (9:6-19 and 32-46); and if there is a match: drop the data packet (9:39);
- analyze a header of the data packet (9:3-8);
- determine information regarding a history of the packet (8:5-16);
- determine a real source of the data packet using the information regarding the history of the packet (8:5-16); and
- refuse to process any additional data packets received from the real source of the data packet (9:6-19 and 32-46).

Regarding claim 30, Coley, discloses a system for blocking an attack on a private network, comprising:

- means for interconnecting a private network to a public network (7:16-19 – “a user operating a host machine 200 who attempts to access the internal network 214 via the public network 202 must go through the firewall”);
- means for receiving a request for connection from an initiator, over the public network (7:41-59 – “firewall 210 application assess the characteristics of an incoming request and assigns an appropriate proxy

agent tailored to the particular protocol and verification requirements of that incoming access request.”);

- means for requesting an acknowledgment from the initiator of the request (7:41-59 – “firewall 210 application assess the characteristics of an incoming request and assigns an appropriate proxy agent tailored to the particular protocol and verification requirements of that incoming access request.”);

Coley is silent in determining whether the acknowledgment has been received within a predetermined amount of time and means for denying the request if the acknowledgment is not received within the predetermined amount of time, however Malkin does provide such a disclosure (5:21-27 – “In step 234, after sending the tunnel registration request, the RAS sets a retransmit time and expects a registration reply from the gateway within a predetermined period of time. The RAS will retransmit the request if a response is not received within the predetermined period of time. After a predetermined number of unsuccessful attempts, the RAS will terminate the PPP connection with the remote node”).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have been motivated to modify the disclosure of Coley

with that of Malkin because both disclosures are directed towards network security, particularly within a remote access network. Malkin provides motivation for this combination in the recitation, to implement the mobile routing protocols, additional software needs to be loaded onto the remote node to enable the node to communication with its original network without having to change its network address. As a result, a user is burdened with installing the mobile protocol software on their computer system and testing it to be sure it operates properly. The need described here lends reason to combine these two references.

Regarding claim 31, Coley, discloses a system for blocking an attack on a private network, comprising:

- means for interconnecting the private network and a public network (7:16-19 – “a user operating a host machine 200 who attempts to access the internal network 214 via the public network 202 must go through the firewall”);
- means for receiving an incoming data packet from the public network;
means for comparing a source address of the data packet against known internal addresses of the private network (7:41-59 – “firewall 210 application assess the characteristics of an incoming request and assigns an appropriate proxy agent tailored to the particular protocol and verification requirements of that incoming access request.”);

Art Unit: 2136

- means for determining if the source address matches a known internal address (9:6-19 and 32-46);
and if there is a match:
- means for dropping the data packet (9:39 – “If there is a discrepancy, the request is denied”);
- analyzing a header of the data packet (9:39);
- determining information regarding a history of the packet (8:5-16);
- determining a real source of the data packet using the information regarding the history of the packet (8:5-16); and
- refusing to process any additional data packets received from the real source of the data packet (9:6-19 and 32-46)

Regarding claim 32, Coley, discloses a software embodied in a computer-readable medium, the computer-readable medium comprising code operable to:

- interconnect a private network to a public network (7:16-19 – “a user operating a host machine 200 who attempts to access the internal network 214 via the public network 202 must go through the firewall”);
- receive a request for connection from an initiator, over the public network; request an acknowledgment from the initiator of the request (7:41-59 – “firewall 210 application assess the characteristics of an incoming request and assigns an appropriate proxy agent tailored to the particular protocol and verification requirements of that incoming access request.”).

Coley is silent in determining whether the acknowledgment has been received within a predetermined amount of time and denying the request if the acknowledgment is not received within the predetermined amount of time, however Malkin does provide such a disclosure (5:21-27 – “In step 234, after sending the tunnel registration request, the RAS sets a retransmit time and expects a registration reply from the gateway within a predetermined period of time. The RAS will retransmit the request if a response is not received within the predetermined period of time. After a predetermined number of unsuccessful attempts, the RAS will terminate the PPP connection with the remote node”).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have been motivated to modify the disclosure of Coley with that of Malkin because both disclosures are directed towards network security, particularly within a remote access network. Malkin provides motivation for this combination in the recitation, to implement the mobile routing protocols, additional software needs to be loaded onto the remote node to enable the node to communication with its original network without having to change its network address. As a result, a user is burdened with installing the mobile protocol software on their computer system and testing it to be sure it operates properly. The need described here lends reason to combine these two references.

Regarding claim 33, Coley, discloses a Software embodied in a computer-readable medium, the computer-readable medium comprising code operable to:

- receive an incoming data packet from the public network (7:16-19 – “a user operating a host machine 200 who attempts to access the internal network 214 via the public network 202 must go through the firewall”);
- compare a source address of the data packet against known internal addresses of the private network (9:6-19 and 32-46);
- determine if the source address matches a known internal address (9:6-19 and 32-46);
and if there is a match:
 - drop the data packet (9:39); analyze a header of the data packet (9:3-8);
 - determine information regarding a history of the packet (8:5-16);
 - determine a real source of the data packet using the information regarding the history of the packet (8:5-16); and
 - refuse to process any additional data packets received from the real source of the data packet (9:6-19 and 32-46).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11-14 and 2-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coley (US Patent No. 6,061,650) and further in view of Levinson et al. (US Application Publication No. 20030053170).

Regarding claim 11, Coley, is silent in disclosing the method of claim 10, wherein using diagnostic tools to determine additional information about a source of the request for connection comprises using trace root diagnostic tools to determine information about the source of the request for connection, however Levinson et al. does disclose network tools used in collection additional about a network (0008 – “network diagnostics”). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosed network diagnostic functions of Levinson et al. into the specific network diagnostic tools mentioned within the claim language such as “trace root, NeStat (NS) lookup, ping, etc.” It would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would know that the disclosed “network diagnostic” functions comprises these specifically mentioned tools.

Art Unit: 2136

Regarding claim 12, Coley, discloses the method of claim 10, wherein using diagnostic tools to determine additional information about a source of the request for connection comprises using ping diagnostic tools to determine information about the source of the request for connection (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 11).

Regarding claim 13, Coley, discloses the method of claim 10, wherein using diagnostic tools to determine additional information about a source of the request for connection comprises using NS lookup diagnostic tools to determine information about the source of the request for connection (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 11).

Regarding claim 14, Coley, discloses the method of claim 10, further comprising forwarding the additional information to a system administrator via electronic mail (0046 – “send a electronic message”).

Regarding claim 22, Coley, discloses the method of claim 15, further comprising using diagnostic tools to determine additional information about a source of the data packet (Rejected under the same rational as claim 11).

Regarding claim 23, Coley, discloses the method of claim 22, wherein using diagnostic tools to determine additional information about a source of the data

Art Unit: 2136

packet comprises using trace root diagnostic tools to determine additional information about the source of the data packet (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 11).

Regarding claim 24, Coley, discloses the method of claim 22, wherein using diagnostic tools to determine additional information about a source of the data packet comprises using ping diagnostic tools to determine additional information about the source of the data packet (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 11).

Regarding claim 25, Coley, discloses the method of claim 22, wherein using diagnostic tools to determine additional information about a source of the data packet comprises using NS lookup diagnostic tools to determine additional information about the source of the data packet (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 11).

Regarding claim 26, Coley, discloses the method of claim 22, further comprising forwarding the additional information to a system administrator via electronic mail (Rejected under the same rationale as claim 11).

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2136

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHINWENDU C. OKORONKWO whose telephone number is (571)272-2662. The examiner can normally be reached on MWF 2:30 - 6:00, TR 9:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on (571) 272 4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nasser G Moazzami/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art

Unit 2436

Application/Control Number: 10/808,629

Page 26

Art Unit: 2136

/C. C. O./

Examiner, Art Unit 2436